

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-27 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections.

According to 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph: "An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof."

Applicants submit that means for performing specified functions as required by claims 15-27, without the recital of structure, are permissible under 35 U.S.C. 112.

For the above reasons, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 101 based rejection of claims 15-27.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (Office Action, page 8, item 13) as being anticipated by Boden (US 5,930,512). Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1-42. No claim amendments have been made by the Applicants.

Independent Claims 1, 15, and 29

Independent claims 1, 15, and 29 are for executing a workflow, and require:

providing a workflow class implementing methods and objects to provide information on and control of workflows;

providing a work list class implementing methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items assigned to the workflows; and

providing a work item class implementing methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items when executing one workflow.

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

Applicants response to Examiner's arguments:

A. Examiner's Improper rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1, 15, 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (Office Action, page 8, item 13) as being anticipated by Boden. Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1, 15, 20.

In rejecting claims 1, 15, 29 the Examiner has cited (Page 3 of the office action) additional references besides Boden, such as, "Workflow Without Fear", by Kelly Trammel, 4/1996, BYTE.com (referred to as Trammel by Applicants), and "Beginning Java 2", What is class?, chapter 5, by Ivor Horton (referred to as Horton by Applicants). However, to reject claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 the Examiner must show a single reference that teaches or discloses all the claim limitations. In the Office Action (Page 3), in order to reject claims 1, 15, 29 the Examiner is relying on disclosure included in additional references besides Boden. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

In the subsequent office action, should the Examiner change the grounds of rejection to be based on 35 U.S.C. 103 rather than on 35 U.S.C. 102, Applicants submit that the office action in response to this response by the Applicants should be a non-final office action because Applicants have not made any amendments to any of the claims.

Applicants submit that the pending claims 1, 15, 29 are patentable over the cited Boden.

B. Neither Boden, nor Trammel, nor Horton individually teach or disclose all the claim limitations

The claims require a workflow class, a work list class, and a work item class. Nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose a workflow class, a work list class, and a work item class as required by the claims. The cited Boden's discusses workflows, but nowhere does the cited Boden discuss a class architecture for workflows. The cited Boden discusses building and running a workflow process model using various description languages but the cited Boden does

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

not teach or disclose a workflow class, a work list class, and a work item class as required by the claims.

The Examiner has presented the discussion of class from the Horton reference and mentioned that the Trammel reference discusses Flowmark (TM) which is an object based product. However, nowhere does the Examiner indicate that the Horton reference or the Trammel reference teaches or discloses a workflow class, a work list class, and a work item class as required by the claims. The Examiner is requested to enter the Horton reference in the Notice of References cited and make available to the Applicants a copy of the Horton reference.

Therefore, neither the cited Bodin reference the Horton reference, nor the Trammel reference individually teach or disclose the claim requirements of a workflow class, a work list class, and work item class as required by the claims. Therefore, the pending claims 1, 15, 29 are patentable over the cited art and cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102.

C. FDL statement 110 of the cited Bodin is not a workflow class of the claim requirements

The Examiner has indicated that the FDL statement 110 is the workflow class of the claim requirements. FDL is an acronym for flowmark data language (cited Bodin, column 10, line 53). Applicants submit that the flowmark definition language does not teach or disclose a workflow class. While the Flowmark (TM) product may be based on object oriented technology as indicated by the Examiner, that does not imply that the flowmark data language statement 110 is the workflow class of the claim requirements.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, the Examiner is requested to indicate how the FDL language teaches or discloses the workflow class of the claim requirements.

D. The modeler 149 of FIG. 8 of the cited Bodin is not a workflow class of the claim requirements

The Examiner has indicated that the modeler 149 of FIG. 8 of the cited Bodin is the workflow class of the claim requirements. While the modeler 149 comprise SOM process objects

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

(cite Biodin, col. 14, lines 64-65), the SOM process objects are different from a worklist class of the claim requirements. Having a workflow process management class library 149, i.e., the modeler, does not indicate that process management class library 149 would include a worklist class of the claim requirements.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, the Examiner is requested to indicate which element of the modeler 149 teaches or discloses the claim requirement of the worklist class.

E. Examiner has not indicated which element of cited Bodin teach or discloses the claim requirement of a work item class.

The Examiner has indicated that the backend 148 of the cited Bodin in combination with the modeler 149 can be interpreted to disclose the work item class of the claim requirements. While the cited Bodin discusses work items and the transfer of work items, nowhere does the cited Bodin teach or disclose the claim requirement of a work item class. The Examiner is using hindsight is interpreting the cited Bodin to reject the claims.

For the above reasons the claims 1, 15, 29 are patentable over the cited art and are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Previously presented arguments by the Applicants

The claims require all of the following requirements that the cited Boden (FIG. 8, items 110, 144; FIG. 5, item 412; FIG. 8, item 419; FIG. 8, items 148, 116, 188, 152) does not teach or disclose:

- (a) a workflow class that implements methods and objects to provide information on and control of workflows
- (b) a work list class that implements methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items assigned to the workflows
- (c) a work item class that implementing methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items when executing one workflow.

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

The Examiner has indicated that the cited Boden in FIG. 8 items 110, 144 discusses the claim requirement of providing a workflow class implementing methods and objects to provide information on and control of workflows. FIG. 8 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model translator for building an HTML statement of a workflow process from an FDL statement 110 which is the description of that workflow process (Boden: col. 14: lines 51-59). The item 110 in the cited Boden is the description of the workflow process in a flowmark definition language. The item 144 is a front end processor (Boden: col. 15, lines 5-10) that includes compilers, a yacc grammar for the flowmark definition language, etc. The front end processor parses the FDL statement using a grammar and generates call referred to as front-end methods (Boden: col. 15: lines 64-67). Various calls are described in col. 16 of Boden, e.g. BuildProcess, BuildDataStructure, BuildActivity, BuildNodeSetting, BuildProgram, BuildDescription, etc. These calls described in the cited Boden may build various objects. While the cited Boden discusses calls and objects, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirement of a workflow class that implements methods and objects to provide information on and control of workflows. The cited item 110 is a flowmark definition language and is not a workflow class, the cited item 144 is a front end processor and is not a workflow class. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which item is the workflow class in the cited Boden.

The Examiner has indicated that FIG. 5, item 412 of the cited Boden, and FIG. 8, item 149 of the cited Boden discuss the claim requirement of a work list class that implements methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items assigned to the workflows. Item 412 of the cited Boden denotes a worklist. Item 149 of the cited Boden denotes process objects. Therefore, the cited Boden discusses a worklist and process objects. However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirement of the worklist class, where the worklist class implements methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items assigned to the workflows. The cited Boden discusses a worklist, but nowhere is there any requirement of a worklist class as required by the claims. Should the

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which item is the worklist class in the cited Boden, and/or in which lines of the cited Boden the worklist class of the claim requirement is discussed.

The Examiner has indicated that FIG. 8, items 148, 116, 188, and 152 discusses the claim requirement of providing a work item class implementing methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items when executing one workflow. Item 148 is a back end, item 116 is a modified FDL code, item 188 is an WMFC output, and item 152 is an HTML output, i.e., items 116, 188, 152 are various outputs of the back end in the form of a description language such as HTML, FDL, or WMFC. Therefore item 148 is a backend, and items 116, 188, and item 152 are various outputs in a description language, and nowhere do these items or the related description in the cited Boden, teach or disclose the claim requirement of providing a work item class implementing methods and objects to provide information on and manipulate work items when executing one workflow. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which item is the work item class in the cited Boden, and/or in which lines of the cited Boden the work item class of the claim requirement is discussed.

In fact, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose a workflow class, a work list class, and a work item class as required by the claims. While the cited Boden's discuss workflows, nowhere does the cited Boden discuss a class architecture for workflows. The cited Boden discusses building and running a workflow process model using various description languages. Nowhere does the cited Boden, teach or disclose a workflow class, a work list class, and a work item class as required by the claims.

For the above reasons claims 1, 15, and 29 are patentable over the cited Boden.

Dependent claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-42

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

The Examiner has also rejected pending claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-42 that depend on the pending independent claims 1, 15, or 29. Applicants traverse these rejections. Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 15, or 29 which are patentable over the cited art for the reason discussed above, and because the combination of the limitations in the dependent claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-42 and the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

The Examiner has on page 6 of the office action indicated that the rejection of claims 1, 15, 29 in conjunction with his previously cited arguments support the rejection of the dependent claims 10-14, 16-29, and 30-42. However, in continuing to reject dependent claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-48 the Examiner has not responded to specific arguments provided below by the Applicants, nor cited additional and/or specific sections of the cited reference that disclose all the claim requirements.

If the Examiner maintains the rejection of the dependent claims Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite to specific sections of the cited references that disclose the dependent claim requirements as nearly as practicable. See, 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2) ("When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable"); MPEP Rev. 2, May 2004, 707, pg. 700-104.

Claims 2, 16, 30

Claims 2, 16, and 30 depend on claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively and further require:
calling methods in the workflow class to begin and terminate an instance of one workflow comprising nodes;
calling methods in the work list class to obtain information on the work items and nodes in one workflow; and

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

calling the methods in the work item class to enable a user to perform actions associated with one work item in one workflow, wherein at least one work item is associated with each node in the workflow.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

Nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of the workflow class, the work list class, and the work item class, as discussed in the arguments for the patentability of claims 1, 15, 29. Since the claim requirement of the workflow class, the work list class, and the work item classes are not taught or disclosed by the cited Boden, methods on these classes are required by claims 2, 16, 30 are not taught or disclosed by the cited Boden.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirement of calling methods in the workflow class to begin and terminate an instance of one workflow comprising nodes; calling methods in the work list class to obtain information on the work items and nodes in one workflow; and calling the methods in the work item class to enable a user to perform actions associated with one work item in one workflow, wherein at least one work item is associated with each node in the workflow.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which item in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden)

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

discloses the methods of the work flow class, the work list class, and the work item class, of the claim requirements.

Claims 3, 17, 31

Claims 3, 17, and 31 depend on claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively and further require:
calling one method in the work list class to determine nodes and associated work items in the workflow to process;

calling one method in the work item class to lock the work item when providing a user access to workflow actions and documents associated with the work item; and

calling one method in the work item class to unlock the work item after the user has completed all actions associated with the work item.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden teach or discloses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden teach or discloses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden teach or discloses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of calling methods in the work list class to determine nodes and associated work items, and one method in the work item class to lock and unlock the work item.

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements of calling methods in the work list class to determine nodes and associated work items, and one method in the work item class to lock and unlock the work item.

Claims 4, 18, and 32

Claims 4, 18, and 32 depend on claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively and further require: providing a workflow notification class including methods and objects to provide information on notifications associated with the workflows, wherein one notification is generated if an action associated with one work item is not performed in a specified time period; and calling methods in the workflow notification class to obtain information on one notification and control a state of the notification.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of a workflow notification class and calling methods in the workflow notification class.

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements of a workflow notification class and calling methods in the workflow notification class.

Claims 5, 19, and 33

Claims 5, 19, and 33 depend on claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively and further require:
providing a workflow service class including methods and objects to provide information on workflows associated with one workflow service; and
calling one method in the workflow service class to obtain a list of all workflows associated with one workflow service.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of calling one method in the workflow service class to obtain a list of all workflows associated with one workflow service.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden)

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

discloses the claim requirements of calling one method in the workflow service class to obtain a list of all workflows associated with one workflow service.

Claims 6, 20, and 34

Claims 6, 20, and 34 depend on claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively and further require:
providing a container class including methods and objects to provide information and control containers provided for workflows, wherein the container comprises an object that is used to transfer information among nodes by enabling users to read and write data to the container;
and

calling the methods in the container class to read and write data to the container for at least one user of one work item.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of providing a container class and calling the methods in the container class. .

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements of providing a container class and calling the methods in the container class.

Claims 7, 21, and 35

Claims 2, 16, and 30 depend on claims 6, 20, and 44 respectively and further require:
calling methods in the work item class to make one container associated with one work item available to one user of one work item; and

calling one method in the work item class to enable one user of one work item at a next node in the workflow access to the container.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of calling methods in the work item class to make one container associated with one work item available to one user of one work item; and calling one method in the work item class to enable one user of one work item at a next node in the workflow access to the container.

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements of calling methods in the work item class to make one container associated with one work item available to one user of one work item; and calling one method in the work item class to enable one user of one work item at a next node in the workflow access to the container.

Claims 8, 22, and 36

Claims 8, 22, and 36 depend on claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively and further require:

instantiating a workflow object maintaining information on one workflow, wherein the methods of the workflow class obtain information and control the workflow through variables in the workflow object representing the workflow;

instantiating a work list object maintaining information on work items and nodes in one workflow, wherein the methods of the work list class obtain information on work items and nodes in one workflow; and

instantiating one work item object for each work item in one workflow, wherein the methods of the work item class obtain information on work items from the work item objects, wherein one work list object identifies one or more work items represented by work item objects and wherein one workflow object is associated with one or more work items.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements that the methods of the workflow class obtain information and control the workflow through variables in the workflow object representing the workflow and that the methods of the work list class obtain information on work items and nodes in one workflow

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements that the methods of the workflow class obtain information and control the workflow through variables in the workflow object representing the workflow and that the methods of the work list class obtain information on work items and nodes in one workflow.

Claims 9, 23, and 37

Claims 9, 23, and 37 depend on claims 8, 22, and 36 respectively and further require:
providing a workflow service class including methods and objects to provide information on workflows associated with one workflow service; and

instantiating a workflow service object maintaining information on workflows and work lists for the workflows associated with one workflow service, wherein the methods of the workflow service obtain information on workflows and work lists from the workflow service object.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

Amdt, dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG. 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements that the methods of the workflow service obtain information on workflows and work lists from the workflow service object.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements that the methods of the workflow service obtain information on workflows and work lists from the workflow service object.

Claims 10, 24, and 38

Claims 10, 24, and 38 depend on claims 9, 23, and 37 respectively and further require that the workflow service object includes information on associated workflow templates, wherein each instance of an executing workflow is instantiated from one workflow template, further comprising:

providing a workflow template class including methods and objects to provide information on one workflow template associated with one workflow service; and

instantiating a workflow template object maintaining information on one workflow template, wherein one or more workflow objects are associated with one workflow template object.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG. 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of providing a workflow template class.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements of providing a workflow template class.

Claims 11, 25, and 39

Claims 11, 25, and 39 depend on claims 10, 24, and 38 respectively and further require that the workflow service object includes information on one or more associated workflow templates, and wherein one method of the workflow service class is called to obtain information on the one or more workflow templates associated with the workflow service.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL92000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

objects. FIG. 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirement that one method of the workflow service class is called to obtain information on the one or more workflow templates associated with the workflow service.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements that one method of the workflow service class is called to obtain information on the one or more workflow templates associated with the workflow service.

Claims 12, 26, and 40

Claims 12, 26, and 40 depend on claims 8, 22, and 36 respectively and further require: providing a workflow notification class including methods and objects to provide information on notifications associated with one workflow that generate a notification if an action associated with one work item is not performed in a specified time period; and

instantiating one workflow notification object maintaining information on one workflow notification, wherein one or more workflow notifications are associated with one workflow and wherein one work list includes one or more workflow notifications.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG. 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of providing a workflow notification class and instantiating one workflow notification object.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements of providing a workflow notification class and instantiating one workflow notification object.

Claims 13, 27, and 41

Claims 13, 27, and 41 depend on claims 8, 22, and 36 respectively and further require:
providing a container class including methods and objects to provide information on and control of containers used in workflows to transport data among the nodes, wherein a container object comprises an object that is used to transfer information among the nodes by enabling users to read and write data to a container; and

instantiating one container object maintaining information on one container used in a workflow, wherein one container object is associated with one workflow object and one work item.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

The Examiner has cited FIG. 8, items 220-248, 149, 250-268; FIG. 12, 9: 54-57 of the cited Boden in rejecting these claims. FIGs. 8 items 220-248, 149, 250-268 of the cited Boden and the related discussion discusses the calling of various build processes to build certain objects. FIG, 12 of the cited Boden discusses a workflow process model summary and a graphical display. Col. 9: lines 54-57 of the cited Boden discusses the creation of a process activity to call another process.

The cited Boden discusses that processes are used to build various objects such as data structure objects, activity objects, etc. (col 16: lines 1-69). However, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirements of providing a container class and instantiating one container object.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which items in the cited Boden (and the corresponding lines of the cited Boden) discloses the claim requirements of providing a container class and instantiating one container object.

Claims 14, 28, and 42

Claims 14, 28, and 42 depend on claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively and further require that the classes comprise object oriented classes.

The Examiner has not provided any specific arguments for continued rejection of the claims in response to the previous arguments presented by the Applicants. Applicants have repeated the previous arguments for the patentability of the claims and request the Examiner to provide reasons for the rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has cited FIG. 6, items 148, 152 of the cited Boden to reject the claim 14, 28, and 42. Item 148 of the cited Boden is an HTML back end and item 152 of the cited Boden are SOM HTML objects. In FIG. 8 the HTML back end takes SOM process objects and generates SOM HTML objects. However, the classes being referred to in claims 14, 28, and 32 are the workflow class, the work list class, and the work item class of the independent claims 1, 15, and

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004
Reply to Office action of 11/29/2004

Serial No. 09/894,076
Docket No. STL920000099US1
Firm No. 0055.0044

29. Therefore, claims 14, 28, and 42 require that the workflow class, the work list class, and the work item classes be object oriented classes. While objects are discussed in the cited Boden, nowhere does the cited Boden teach or disclose the claim requirement that the workflow class, the work list class, and the work item classes are object oriented classes.

Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of the claims, the Examiner is requested to indicate which lines of the cited Boden discusses the claim requirement that the workflow class, the work list class, and the work item classes are object oriented classes.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have indicated appropriate fees. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 557-2292 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: Feb. 22, 2005

By: 

Rabindranath Dutta
Registration No. 51,010

Please direct all correspondences to:

Rabindranath Dutta
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-557-2292
Fax: 310-556-7984